

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, and 8 have been amended and claims 2 and 10 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all claims is earnestly solicited in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-14, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,473,102 to Rodden *et al.* (hereinafter "Rodden"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,581,020 to Buote *et al.*, (hereinafter "Buote"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Rodden discloses a system for repositioning windows in response to changes in display configuration. The system applies in particular to repositioning of utility windows in response to actions that may affect the view of such windows on a display. (See Column 1, lines 12-15 of Rodden). In effect, the system of Rodden prevents changes to utility window repositioning that often occur when a display is reconfigured. If a configuration of the display changes, for example as a result of a resolution change, a display manager provides the operating system with notification and the operating system calls a procedure, shown in FIG. 4, for repositioning the window so that all of its controls will be visible as explained in Column 4, lines 13-31.

Buote discloses a data management system that incorporates multiple screens. In an exemplary embodiment all screens have a resolution of 600 X 800 and the display mode of each window depends on the screen resolution set for the computer. If the screen resolution is set at 600 X800, all windows appear in maximized mode. If the computer is set to a higher resolution, all windows appear in window mode as set forth in Column 11, lines 15-21 of Buote.

Both Rodden and Buote lack several features of the invention of claim 1. Neither Buote nor Rodden discloses determining, for the window, whether a display size and display screen position are specified for the window. As set forth above with respect to

Buote, Buote teaches that all windows will be the same size. The size of the window is dependent on the pre-set resolution. With regard to Rodden, while Rodden discloses that a user might be provided with a preference feature as to whether a window remain on the desktop (see column 4, lines 38-43 of Rodden), Rodden does not refer to setting of the screen position or window as required by claim 1. Thus, neither Rodden nor Buote discloses determining, for the window, whether a display size and display screen position are specified for the window as set forth in claim 1.

Since neither reference discloses the determination step, it follows that neither reference discloses if a size and position are specified, rendering the window at the specified size and in the specified position, so that the window is not automatically maximized as set forth in claim 1. Furthermore neither reference discloses determining the screen resolution for the display screen if the size and position are not specified.

Accordingly, even if combined, Rodden and Buote would not have resulted in the claimed invention. In order to make out a prima facie case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must provide all of the elements of the invention as claimed and a suggestion to combine the disclosures of the various cited art references to make the claimed invention. *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686,688 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *ACS Hospital Systems, Inc. v. Montefiore Hospital*, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Additionally, in order to make a prima facie case of obviousness, a teaching or suggestion of the combination must be found in the prior art. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Rodden and Buote are concerned with entirely different problems. While Rodden is concerned with user access to utility windows, Buote is concerned with the general appearance of screen data in view of the selected resolution. With Buote, all windows receive the same treatment. Either all windows are maximized or no windows are maximized. Accordingly, Buote teaches away from the disclosure of Rodden, which selectively reinstates utility windows to their original positions. No teaching or suggestion is present for making the asserted combination.

Claim 2 has been cancelled and claims 3-7 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-7 are allowable over Buote and Rodden for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

With regard to claim 8, similar arguments as those explained above with respect to claim 1 can be applied. Both Rodden and Buote fail to disclose determining, for the window, whether a display size and display screen position are specified for the window, and if a size and position are specified, rendering the window at the specified size and in the specified position. Furthermore, neither Rodden nor Buote discloses the claimed steps if no position and size are specified. The claimed steps include determining current screen resolution, comparing current screen resolution with a selected resolution threshold, and automatically maximizing the size of the window on the display screen if the current screen resolution is below the selected resolution threshold. Thus, even if combined, Buote and Rodden would not have resulted in the invention of claim 8.

Furthermore, claim 8 as a whole claims selective maximization of windows. Since Buote discloses uniform maximization of all windows, no teaching is provided for the selective maximization.

Claims 9 and 11-13 depend from claim 8 and define over Buote and Rodden for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8. Claim 10 has been canceled, rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim.

With regard to claim 14, both Buote and Rodden fail to disclose determining, for the window, whether a display size and display screen position are specified for the window, and if a size and position are specified, rendering the window at the specified size and in the specified position. Additionally, neither Buote nor Rodden discloses determining if the window is capable of being maximized on the display screen. Finally, neither Buote nor Rodden discloses if the window is capable of being maximized, automatically rendering the window in a maximized size on the display screen. Accordingly, even if combined, Buote and Rodden would not have resulted in the claimed invention.

Furthermore, claim 14 as a whole claims selective maximization of windows. Since Buote discloses uniform maximization of all windows, no teaching is provided for

the selective maximization. Rodden does not relate to window maximization, but merely to allowing utility windows to remain visible if a display configuration changes.


Thus, because the combination of Rodden and Buote would not have resulted in the claimed invention and furthermore because no teaching or suggestion is provided for modification as suggested, the references fail to render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of all claims is respectfully requested

CONCLUSION

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 are pending in this application. In view of the amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue. Should any issues remain prior to issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.81059.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2004


Kerry H. Owens
Reg. No. 37,412

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 474-6550